

非英语专业研究生规划教材

研究生英语综合教程 (下)

Integrative English

主编 陈海忠

张红岩



苏州大学出版社
Soochow University Press

中国海洋大学外语教学与研究出版社

研究生英语综合教程

1

中国海洋大学外语教学与研究出版社

非英语专业研究生规划教材

研究生英语综合教程

(下)

主 编

(以姓氏笔画为序,不分先后)

张红岩 陈海忠

苏州大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

研究生英语综合教程. 下/张红岩,陈海忠主编. —苏州:
苏州大学出版社,2008.6
非英语专业研究生规划教材
ISBN 978-7-81137-057-7

I. 研… II. ①张…②陈… III. 英语—研究生—教材
IV. H31

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2008)第 055442 号

研究生英语综合教程(下)

张红岩 陈海忠 主编

(以姓氏笔画为序,不分先后)

责任编辑 谢永明

苏州大学出版社出版发行

(地址:苏州市干将东路200号 邮编:215021)

丹阳市教育印刷厂印装

(地址:丹阳市西门外 邮编:212300)

开本 787mm×1 092mm 1/16 印张 37(共两册) 字数 745 千

2008年6月第1版 2008年6月第1次印刷

ISBN 978-7-81137-057-7 定价:65.00元(共两册)

苏州大学版图书若有印装错误,本社负责调换

苏州大学出版社营销部 电话:0512-67258835

《研究生英语综合教程》(下)编委会

主 编

(以姓氏笔画为序,不分先后)

张红岩 陈海忠

副主编

(以姓氏笔画为序,不分先后)

朱义华 许江明

编 委

(以姓氏笔画为序,不分先后)

王 瑾 朱义华 许江明 刘 燕
陈海忠 周友邦 姜 伟 曹 丹
韩文进

策 划

(以姓氏笔画为序,不分先后)

汤定军 许周鹑 谢永明

编写说明

非英语专业研究生英语教学的历程可追溯到 20 世纪 80 年代中期。我国的非英语专业研究生英语教学经历了 20 多年的长足发展,取得了瞩目的成绩。外语教学专家们借鉴先进的教学理念,精心研究,不断推陈出新,使该类教材更加符合我国非英语专业研究生英语教学的实际,创造了满园春色的今天。《研究生英语综合教程》(上、下)便是这百花园中的一朵美丽的奇葩。

《研究生英语综合教程》(上、下)根据教育部《非英语专业研究生英语(第一外语)教学大纲》编写而成,适用于高等院校文、理、工、医、农、林等各学科的全统招非英语专业的硕士研究生、在职攻读硕士学位的研究生、全国同等学力人员攻读硕士学位的研究生和部分博士研究生。

《研究生英语综合教程》(上、下)的编写指导思想是通过该教材的教学使研究生能够掌握大纲要求的各项阅读技能、写作技能、翻译和话题讨论技能,并通过实践运用这些技能,使学生真正具有较强的英语综合能力,为以英语为工具进行本专业的学习和研究打下坚实的基础。

《研究生英语综合教程》(上、下)共两册,每册各 10 个单元。该教材以《研究生英语教学大纲》和《考试大纲》中要求研究生应该掌握和运用的各项阅读技能、写作技能、翻译技能、口语技能为主线,在每单元课文后系统地讲述写作技巧、翻译技巧,每单元设计阅读 A 和 B 两篇课文,并配有生词、注释以及针对阅读技巧和课文的大量练习。

《研究生英语综合教程》(上、下)具有以下主要特点:

1. 本教材以阅读为主,以写作理论和实践、翻译技巧、口语表达训练为辅,强化非英语专业研究生英语的综合能力。本教材注重基础知识的讲解和练习,同时兼顾能力的加强和提高。

2. 本教材实用性强。本教材紧密结合非英语专业研究生的学习和科研实

际,尽量涵盖各学科专业知识,紧跟最新科研前沿,因此选材更加专业化,更加符合发展非英语专业研究生英语各项能力的需要。本教材阅读部分可读性、趣味性和真实性强,所选阅读材料语言纯正、规范,大部分课文选自英美等英语国家的大型媒体,如 *Times*, *Science*。写作部分从基础理论入手,逐步深化,一直到专业论文写作,有着极强的目标性。翻译部分强调翻译技巧的具体应用,注重翻译实践能力的培养。口语部分以话题为中心,通过讨论来发展学术英语的口语表达能力。各部分都配有大量的习题,每课后面设计的阅读、词汇和综合填空题等与研究生学位课统考题形式一致,因此也可以作为备考练习之用。

3. 本教材可操作性强。根据非英语专业研究生英语教学现状,将阅读、写作、翻译、口语融为一体,克服了各项训练自成一体的分离局面,符合非英语专业研究生英语教学课时紧、任务重的教学现实。

4. 本教材的编者科研和教学实力很强,均为非英语专业研究生英语教学第一线的专家,他们中的多数具有教授、副教授职称或博士学位,具有多年非英语专业研究生英语教学与测试经验。

由于时间仓促,编者水平有限,本教材肯定会存在一些不足之处,敬请使用本教材的师生批评指正。

编 者

2008年5月5日

Contents

Unit 1 Politics 1



Unit 2 Literature 29



Unit 3 Economy 54



Unit 4 Religious Beliefs and Ethics 84



Unit 5 Medicine and Health 115



Unit 6 History 145



Unit 7 Arts 172



Unit 8 Psychology and Biology 204



Unit 9 Philosophy 236



Unit 10 Media 267



Unit 1

Politics

Pre-reading Questions

1. How do Americans elect their president?
2. Where does campaign finance come from?
3. Is campaign finance reform necessary?

Reading

Text A

Campaign Finance Reform Is Not Necessary

John Mueller

Calls for campaign finance reform are misguided. The undisciplined, chaotic, and essentially unequal interplay of special interests and politics is not a perversion of democracy but its whole point. In fact, the influence of special interests is a unique element of democracy.

Many autocratic governments effectively allow individuals to petition government with their grievances. The difference is that in democracies people are allowed to organize to pursue their interests. As University of Rochester political scientist Richard Niemi states, "Special interests R us."

People and groups who seek to influence public policy do so because they really care about certain issues and programs. If reformers somehow manage to reduce the impact of special interests in election campaigns, the groups are very likely to find other ways to get their point of view across no matter how clever the laws that seek to make it difficult for them. Indeed, special interests do so now. Most of what democratic governments actually do on a day-to-day basis is the result of organized pressure and petition, or lobbying. Thus, it is highly questionable that the government will adopt notably different policies even if campaign donations are restricted.

A rare voice of realism amid all the politically correct bluster from politicians about campaign finance reform is that of Senator Robert Bennett of Utah who points out that special interests and rich people “will always have influence in politics.” The solution is not to create barriers that impel them to “spend even more money to hire lawyers and consultants to find ways around the law to get the same results.”

Money Doesn't Equal Corruption

Political scientist Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution sums up the conclusions of many academic studies on this issue, “Most votes in the House and Senate are influenced by party, ideology, and constituency interests, not campaign contributions. Donations from groups with legislative interests are more likely to follow votes in Congress than to determine them.” Sensibly, people in Congress will pay attention to the desires and arguments of interest groups, but this means they are doing their job, not that they are collecting bribes.

If the process sometimes gives the appearance of corruption, this is partly because campaign finance reformers keep calling it corruption, often without very much evidence beyond vague conjecture. If you rearrange the toothpaste on a store shelf, you may give the appearance of shoplifting, but you cannot be convicted of the crime unless you walk off with a tube. Politicians should be held to the same standard, not simply judged by accusation. What needs to be reformed is not so much the system as the misinformed views about how that system works. Reformers seem determined to increase these confusions.

Calls for a Level Playing Field Are Misguided

The central democratic notion that people are created equal simply suggests that they are born equal. In a democracy nobody is denied political opportunity



merely because of birth into the wrong social or economic class, or because of adherence to the wrong ideology. But this does not suggest that people must or even should be equal in their impact on the political system. 45

Indeed, democracy is fundamentally a system in which people are free to become as politically active or inactive as they choose—that is, they are equally free to become politically unequal. In choosing a course in life, a person can seek political power or influence by working in politics or devoting time or money to political causes. Essentially, the system is one of rule by the minority and acquiescence by the majority. Most citizens actually choose to be politically inactive. As a consequence people who do organize behind a cause or policy enjoy a louder voice. 50

This means that democracies are often quite sensitive to small groups when they organize to seek redress, whether they are racial minorities, gay-rights advocates, beekeepers, yacht owners, disabled veterans, or any of a countless variety of special interests. Democracies are thus responsive and attentive to the interests of the citizenry—at least when compared to other forms of government—but they are nowhere near equally responsive to the interests of each citizen all the time and cannot be made so, even by well-meaning legislation. 60

Most of the agitation is focused on the special privileges that one category of special interest, big business, is presumed to enjoy. But if a business leader's access advantage to a time-pressured politician is somehow bad and must be reformed, what about other inequalities—that is, why focus only on economic ones? A telephone call from a big-time political columnist for a newspaper or magazine is likely to get a politician's attention even faster than that of an important business leader. Should the influential columnist hold off on an upcoming column until the rest of us deserving unknowns have had a chance to put in our two cents in the same forum? 65

Political inequalities like these are as unavoidable as inequalities in other aspects of life. It may be possible to reduce this inequality a bit, but it is difficult to imagine a reform that could possibly raise the political impact of the average factory worker—or even of the average business executive—remotely to equal that enjoyed by a major political columnist, for example. 70

The Incumbent Advantage

Cynicism about politics and politicians is common in democracies, in part 75

because reformers keep theorizing that democracy should somehow look much different than it always has. Despite this cynicism, however, voters routinely return most incumbents to office. One study notes that in 1992 voters in 14 states
80 imposed term limits on members of Congress. They then proceeded to reelect all but 6 of the 116 incumbents on the ballot, including 70 who had been in office longer than the term limits that some of these same voters chose to impose.

Indeed, because of this voter behavior, about the only way to remove an incumbent is for the opposition to raise a lot of money. In other words, campaign
85 spending limitations are likely to benefit, not harm, most incumbents.

Reform Is Unnecessary and Ineffective

The entire cost of the elections of 1996 was about 25 percent of what Procter & Gamble routinely spends every year to market its products. Reformers claim this is excessive, but in what sense is this too much? Some people weary of
90 the constant advertising barrage at election time, but democracy leaves them entirely free to flip to another channel, the same method used so effectively to avoid learning about commercial products.

Pumping public money into the campaign system may sometimes help at getting certain unusual points of view across, but it carries disadvantages as well.
95 Where it has been tried, it often creates strange effects—generally without changing the election outcome. In the 2000 elections in the United States, the Reform Party mostly spent its time on internal battles, and just about the only reason it existed at all was to collect its \$13 million from the Presidential Campaign Finance Fund, an outgrowth of campaign finance reform of the
100 1970s.

The record of campaign finance reform thus far is not very encouraging. In fact, most of the heralded problems of campaign finance are actually the perverse consequences of earlier reforms. “For all the pious hopes,” notes historian Gil Troy of McGill University in Montréal, Québec, Canada, “the goal of the
105 Watergate-era reforms—to remove the influence of money from presidential elections—was, in hard and inescapable fact, ridiculous.”

Limits on contributions have enhanced the comparative advantage of billionaires such as Ross Perot and Steve Forbes who can finance their campaigns out of their own pockets—hardly a gain for equality. And, by capping individual
110 contributions to candidates at a ludicrously low \$1,000, never adjusting for

inflation, the reforms caused money to be channeled into party coffers in the form of soft money, or into direct issue advertising. Both of these effects more or less reflect the intentions of the reformers, but they have now been determined by later reformers to be bad things.

If soft money is a problem, it can be arrested by increasing or, preferably, abandoning the \$1,000 limit on individual contributions to candidates. Politicians seem to find it politically incorrect to advocate this sensible change, even though it would probably reduce the amount of time they spend campaigning for campaign funds, yet another bad effect of the earlier reforms. Instead, there has been a drive to cap party donations.

If the drive is successful, people who want to express their views—or grind their axes—in public will increasingly abandon parties and candidates and seek to influence policy by advertising their views directly to the public. Alarmed at this prospect, some reformers have now taken aim even at this form of individual expression. Since advocacy by such special interests is the very stuff of the democratic process, the unintended and ill-advised goal of the campaign reformers ultimately seems to be the repeal of democracy itself.

(From *Microsoft Encarta*, 2007)



New Words and Expressions

undisciplined	<i>a.</i>	lacking control and organization; behaving badly
chaotic	<i>a.</i>	in a state of complete confusion and disorder
interplay	<i>n.</i>	the way in which two or more things affect each other; interaction
perversion	<i>n.</i>	the act of changing sth. that is good or right into sth. that is bad or wrong; the result of this
petition	<i>v.</i>	to make a formal request to sb. in authority
grievance	<i>n.</i>	sth. that you think is unfair and that you complain or protest about
lobby	<i>v.</i>	to try to influence a politician or the government and, for example, persuade them to support or oppose a change in the law
bluster	<i>n.</i>	talking in an aggressive or threatening way, but with

		little effect; bark
conjecture	<i>n.</i>	an opinion or idea that is not based on definite knowledge and is formed by guessing
acquiescence	<i>n.</i>	the fact of being willing to do what sb. wants and to accept their opinions, even if you are not sure that they are right
redress	<i>n.</i>	payment, etc. that you should get for sth. wrong that has happened to you or harm that you have suffered
citizenry	<i>n.</i>	all the citizens of a particular town, country, etc.
agitation	<i>n.</i>	worry and anxiety that you show by behaving in a nervous way
presume	<i>v.</i>	to suppose that sth. is true, although you do not have actual proof
incumbent	<i>a.</i>	having an official position
	<i>n.</i>	a person who has an official position
ballot	<i>n.</i>	the piece of paper on which sb. marks who they are voting for
barrage	<i>n.</i>	a large number of sth., such as questions or comments, that are directed at sb. very quickly, one after the other, often in an aggressive way
flip	<i>v.</i>	to turn over into a different position with a sudden quick movement; to make sth. do this
outgrowth	<i>n.</i>	a natural development or result of sth.
herald	<i>v.</i>	to be a sign that sth. is going to happen
perverse	<i>a.</i>	showing deliberate determination to behave in a way that most people think is wrong, unacceptable or unreasonable
cap	<i>v.</i>	to limit the amount of money that can be charged for sth. or spent on sth.
ludicrously	<i>ad.</i>	ridiculously and unreasonably
coffer	<i>n.</i>	a way of referring to the money that a government, an organization, etc. has available to spend
advocacy	<i>n.</i>	the giving of public support to an idea, a course of

		action or a belief
repeal	<i>n.</i>	abolition of law
get across		to be communicated or understood; to succeed in communicating sth.
hold off		not to do sth. immediately
impose on		to force sb./sth. to have to deal with sth. that is difficult or unpleasant
all but		everything or everyone except sb./sth.
weary of		to lose one's interest in or enthusiasm for
pump ... into sth.		to put a lot of money into sth.
have an axe to grind		to have private reasons for being involved in sth. or for arguing for a particular cause

Notes

1. John Mueller

⇒ a professor of political science at the Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. His most recent book is *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ralph's Pretty Good Grocery* (1999).

2. Watergate

⇒ a 1972 US political scandal stemming from a break-in by Republican operatives at the 1972 US Democratic National Committee headquarters, which were in the Watergate complex in Washington, D. C. The scandal led to the resignation of President Nixon and the conviction and imprisonment of a number of his closest aides.

3. Ross Perot

⇒ also Henry Ross Perot, born on June 27, 1930, Texarkana, Texas, US. He is a businessman and philanthropist, who was an independent candidate for US president in 1992 and 1996.

4. Steve Forbes

⇒ also Malcolm Stevenson Forbes, Jr., born on July 18, 1947, Morristown, N. J., US. He is a publishing executive who was twice a candidate for the nomination of the Republican Party for president.

5. soft money

⇒ nonfederal political funds raised from unions, corporations, and wealthy donors outside the restrictions of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, which can be used to fund political parties at state rather than federal level.

Exercises

Reading Comprehension

A. Choose the best answer according to Text A.

1. Calls for campaign finance reform are misguided because _____.
 - A. they confuse people
 - B. they are undisciplined, chaotic and essentially unequal
 - C. money doesn't equal corruption
 - D. the interplay of special interests and politics is a part of the democratic process
2. What are special interests in democracies according to the text?
 - A. Special interests are people.
 - B. Special interests are capitalists.
 - C. Special interests are governments.
 - D. Special interests are groups of special people.
3. The reasons why money doesn't equal corruption include all of the following EXCEPT that _____.
 - A. most votes in Congress are influenced by some factors other than contributions
 - B. people in Congress pay attention to the desires and arguments instead of collecting bribes
 - C. campaign finance reformers keep calling it corruption, but actually, it is not
 - D. you cannot be convicted of stealing unless you walk off with a tube of toothpaste
4. The author implied that _____.
 - A. campaign finance reform will not influence the government's policy
 - B. campaign finance reform will force the government to change its policy

